DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 843 UD 014 081

TITLE	Evaluation of State Urban Education Programs, Community School District 15.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	77p.; Function Number 61-36450, 36453, 36463
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Anti Social Behavior; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Education; *Guidance Personnel; Multimedia Instruction; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Program Evaluation; Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Programs; School Districts; Secondary Education; *Student Behavior; Truancy; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

There were three projects, funded under Urban Education auspices, carried out in various schools in District 15, Brooklyn, during the 1972-73 school year. The objectives of the Return to School program were to place students, who exhibited anti-social behavior or who were frequently truant, into special instructional units where their educational and social needs would be met. A specific objective was to prepare these youth for a return to their regular classrooms. This program was based in school and non-school facilities. The Guidance Aides program was based in seven elementary schools, one intermediate school, and three junior high schools--all in District 15, Brooklyn. Paraprofessionals--young adults well known in the school communities which they served--were assigned to work as assistants to the guidance counselors in their work with educationally and economically disadvantaged children and their parents. The third project is composed of two seperate programs funded under State Urban Education. The Diagnostic Reading Program's major objectives were (1) to show significant positive changes in reading achievement and basic reading skills for those children who are retarded in reading ability and (2) to provide teacher training through demonstration lessons for the classroom teacher. The program consisted of three components: small group teaching, demonstration and/or team teaching, and individual tutoring. The major objective of the Multi-Media Program was to improve the reading skills of retarded readers by supplementing their regular classroom reading program with laboratory experiences. (Author/JM)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Function No. 61-36450
61-36453
61-36463

EVALUATION OF STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS,

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 15

An evaluation of New York City school district educational project funded by the "New York State Urban Education Program" enacted at the 1970 Legislative session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty" (Education Law 3602, Subdivision II as amended), performed under a contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1972-1973 school year.

Professor Sheldon Kastner
Project Director

Professor Merrill T. Hollinshead
Project Coordinator

Professor Emilio Guerra
Professor June McLeod
Professor Elazar Pedhazur
Professor Lenore Ringler
Professor Irene Shigaki
Professor Gilbert Trachtman
Consultants

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

July 1973

ED 094607

New York University

School of Education
Center for Educational Research and Field Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 Press Building
Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003
Telephone: (212) 598-2898, 3425

July 31, 1973

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni
Director (Acting)
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Polemeni:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated January 8, 1973 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Educational Research and Field Services, I am pleased to submit three hundred copies of the final report, An Evaluation of the District Fifteen State Urban Education Programs.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under the State Urban Education Program, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modification and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
DISTRICT 15 - DIAGNOSTIC READING	7
GUIDANCE AIDES	32
RETURN TO SCHOOL PROGRAM	41
APPENDIX A Observer Check List	49
APPENDIX B Staff Evaluation Form	53
APPENDIX C Reading Teacher Background	65
EVALUATION STAFF	69

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There were three projects, funded under Urban Education auspices, carried out in various schools in District 15, Brooklyn, during the 1972-1973 school year. These programs were designated as (1) Return to School; (2) Guidance Aides; and (3) Diagnostic Reading (including Multi-Media Labs).

Return to School

The objectives of the Return to School program were to place students, who exhibited anti-social behavior or were frequently truant, into special instructional units where their educational and social needs would be met. A specific objective was to prepare these youth for a return to their regular classrooms.

This program was based in school and non-school facilities (rooms in churches, school annexes). The students came from three junior high schools and two intermediate schools. They were referred by school principals, guidance counselors, and deans of students. One hundred and thirty students were registered in the five units. The main academic emphases were on reading and arithmetic, since the students were particularly retarded in these areas. Each unit was staffed by two teachers and two paraprofessional workers; instruction took place in small groups or on a one-to-one basis. Many of the students stayed in the special units for only part of the day, returning to their regular nearby school for lunch, gymnasium,

shops, and assembly programs. Special instructional materials were furnished for each unit, as aids to individual teaching.

The five units functioned rather autonomously during the first half of the year, with some consultation and supervision being furnished by the schools from which the students came. During the second half of the year, a coordinator for the program was appointed.

The evaluation objectives of the program were based upon a plan to assess changes in the students' self concepts, attitudes toward school, and participation in academic activities. In March, 1973, however, a directive from Albany (Bureau of Urban and Community Program Evaluation) asked that all evaluations should focus upon changes in academic achievement, with comparisons between April, 1972 and April, 1973 reading scores being given greatest priority.

Sixty-six students out of the total of 130 on the registers were present in school at the time of administration of the reading scores in the two years. Comparisons of the Metropolitan Reading Tests scores -- pre and post -- were made in order to determine whether the students made gains in achievement greater than might have been predicted if they had not had the benefit of special instruction. A statistically reliable difference was found between the April, 1973 scores and the predicted scores; the actual gains were greater than the predicted gains.

The evaluation team recommended that this program be recycled next year. Participating students improved in their reading achievement, in their behavior, and in their interest in continuing in school. The program was well organized, and functioned in terms of its objectives.

Guidance Aides

The Guidance Aides program was based in seven elementary schools, one intermediate school, and three junior high schools -- all in District 15, Brooklyn. Paraprofessionals -- young adults well known in the school communities which they served -- were assigned to work as assistants to the guidance counselors in their work with educationally and economically disadvantaged children and their parents. The aides, under the direction of counselors, carried out the following assignments.

- Assisting the counselor with clerical assignments
- Interviewing individual children
- Accompanying children to clinics
- Accompanying children and parents to new schools to which the former had been transferred
- Assisting counselors with bi-lingual interviews
- Helping to fill out working papers for students
- Answering the telephone in the Guidance Office
- Acting as receptionnst in the Guidance Office
- Escorting children from their classrooms to the counselor
- Making home visits, with counselors
- Helping the counselors in record keeping

In addition, each aide was assigned a caseload of 30 children for whom he had a special responsibility, and whom he saw regularly and upon those occasions of crisis or special difficulties. Thus the aides provided assistance to the guidance counselors, relieving them of many routine duties, and freeing them for educational and vocational counseling activities.

Originally, the evaluation objectives were stated in terms of determining whether or not guidance counselors to whom aides had been assigned were found to be more effective in carrying out their duties than were counselors in schools with no Guidance Aides (controls). However, in March, 1973, a directive from Albany (Bureau of Urban and Community Program Evaluation) asked that all evaluations should be concerned with changes in academic achievement, with comparisons between the April, 1972 and April, 1973 reading test scores. The changed evaluation objectives were stated as follows:

> On the basis of the Metropolitan Reading Test scores, through an application of inferential statistics, reading achievement growth would be assessed to determine whether growth changes were greater than would have been expected solely on the basis of classroom instruction.

In other words, did the Guidance Aides activities as assistants to the guidance counselors positively effect the achievement of children in the designated caseloads of the Aides.

Data were presented on 157 children who were given special guidance by the Aides. This sample included all children who were present at the time that the 1972 and 1973 reading tests were administered, who were able to read and comprehend test instructions, and who were not mentally retarded. Comparisons between the two-year scores and the predicted post-test scores were significant at the .05 level.

The services of the Guidance Aides were enthusiastically evaluated by counselors, teachers, and school administrators. The Aides fitted into the school family, and provided valuable assistance to the counselors

who were thus able to devote more time to educational and vocational guidance functions.

The evaluation team strongly recommended that the Guidance Aides program be recycled next year.

Diagnostic Reading

The Diagnostic Reading Program in District 15 is composed of two separate components funded under State Urban Education. The major component has been designated as the Diagnostic Reading Program. The second component shall be referred to as the Multi-Media Labs. These programs will be discussed in two separate sections of this report.

The Diagnostic Reading Program, as instituted in District 15, conformed with the project proposal funded under State Urban Education. The major objectives of the program were (1) to show significant positive changes in reading achievement and basic reading skills for those children who are retarded in reading ability and (2) to provide teacher training through demonstration lessons for the classroom teacher. The program consisted of three components: small group teaching, demonstration and/or team teaching and individual tutoring.

Formal evaluation of the program began in early November. Evaluation focused on the degree to which the objectives of the program were met. Evaluation procedures included site visits to all of the seven schools, an analysis of data of reading tests administered to a random sample of 250 pupils and an analysis of responses from the staff to rating scales and questionnaires designed to assess their reactions to and perceptions of the program. This final report includes an evaluation of the projects implementation, an assessment of the projects' effectiveness in increasing reading ability and an evaluation of the program by the staff participants.

FINDINGS

Analysis of the data collected yielded the following findings:

1. Observation of the program in operation indicated that the program was implemented as outlined in the proposal and was functioning very satisfactorily.

2. Analyses of comprehension test scores using the Historical Rate of Growth formula indicated that growth was both highly statistically significant and meaningful. In both Grades 3 and 4 about one-year beyond the predicted growth was achieved.

3. Analysis of the subtests of basic reading skills in Grade 3 indicated highly meaningful and statistical significant gains with the exception of the Vocabulary subtest which was statistically significant but not meaningful.

4. Analysis of the subtests of basic reading skills in Grade 4 indicated statistical significance in all areas, but was meaningful only in Auditory Discrimination, Beginning and Ending Sounds and Blending. In these three areas the mean gain exceeded one standard deviation.

5. In general, ratings by the staff indicated satisfaction with the program and they expressed interest in participating in a similar program next year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, on the basis of site observations, analysis of reading test data and reactions of the staff, the evaluators consider the Diagnostic Reading Program effective in accomplishing its major goals. It is, therefore, recommended that this program be recycled in the 1973-1974 school year.

Some recommendations which might increase the effectiveness of the

program follow:

1. Continue to emphasize teacher training for the classroom teacher by the reading teacher recognizing that the team approach is a major strength of the program.

2. Urge the reading teachers to include a variety of approaches and materials with the recognition that a language-experience approach would be most appropriate for those children whose oral language is linguistically different from standard English.

3. Encourage the reading teacher to select natural reading situations (stories, magazines, newspapers) for application of the skill taught and as a culminating activity.

4. Increase the use of different level and/or skill materials in the individualization of instruction in the small groups within group.

5. Continue evaluation and assessment of individual pupil needs on a continuous on-going basis with chart or journal record keeping.

6. Consider an increase in the time allotted the reading teachers for planning the reading activities carried out by the tutors so that the team approach is further enhanced.

7. Urge school principals to upgrade those physical facilities that are inadequate.

8. Extend the program one grade higher so that those pupils who continue to need remediation can be serviced in an attempt to reach their potential.

9. Select reading personnel with specific training in diagnosis

and remediation of reading difficulties. Evaluators noted the effectiveness of those reading teachers who were highly trained.

In addition to the above recommendations which are specific to the program, we strongly recommend that the school administrators consider the advantages of heterogeneous classroom grouping in their schools. As long as retarded readers are being supported by an individualized reading program, research literature has shown the stimulation and increased teacher expectations derived from heterogeneous grouping has an impact on the learning progress of these pupils.

The Multi-Media Program as instituted in District 15 conformed with the project proposal funded under State Urban Education. The major objective of the program was to improve the reading skills of retarded readers by supplementing their regular classroom reading program with laboratory experiences.

Formal evaluation of the program began in early November. Evaluation procedures included site visits to four of the participating schools and an analysis of data of reading tests administered to a random sample of 307 pupils.

This final report includes an evaluation of the project implementation and an assessment of the projects effectiveness in increasing reading ability.

FINDINGS

Analysis of the data collected yielded the following findings:

1. Observation of the program in operation indicated that the program was implemented and functioning as outlined in the proposal.

2. An analysis of reading test scores using the Historical Reading Growth formula indicated statistically significant differences in Grades 3 and 4 with growth beyond predicted levels. In Grades 6 and 9, the results were both highly significant and meaningful as the difference scores exceed one standard deviation and growth was approximately one year above prediction. In Grade 5 the results were non-significant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, on the basis of site observations and reading test data, the evaluators consider the Multi-Media Program only partially effective in accomplishing its major goal. Although we realize the large amount of funds expended for the EDL program, we recommend that this program not be recycled in the 1973-74 school year in its present form. It is recommended that the Language Laboratory Centers be continued in the 1973-74 school year.

The following recommendations may help to increase the effectiveness of the LLC.

1. Select reading personnel with specific training in diagnostic and remediation of reading difficulties. Evaluators noted the effectiveness of those reading teachers who were highly trained.

2. Hire a minimum of one paraprofessional for each reading teacher to facilitate and augment the program.

3. Set-up a number of informal group meetings so that the reading teachers can share and plan activities.

In addition to the above it is suggested that the school administrators consider using the reading teachers and the LLC as a resource

for the classroom teachers who are not participating in the program. In this way training in the teaching of reading will be disseminated to the total school staff.

It is recommended that the EDL program be continued only if the following changes are instituted:

1. Consider the EDL program and its accompanying materials as application activities for an on-going skills developing program.

2. Initiate the program with an intensive diagnostic work-up of each pupil selected and use only those portions of the EDL program which are applicable to a particular student need.

3. Incorporate a teacher planned reading skills program using both small groups and individual instruction with an emphasis on direct teaching.

4. Use those materials of EDL which are meant to be consumable as such because writing on separate answer sheets changes the task from reading to writing and in addition may be misleading.

DISTRICT 15 - DIAGNOSTIC READING

INTRODUCTION

The Diagnostic Reading Program in District 15 is composed of two separate components funded under State Urban Education. The major component has been designated as the Diagnostic Reading Program. The second component shall be referred to as the Multi-Media Labs. These programs will be discussed in two separate sections of this report.

DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM

Program Description

The Diagnostic Reading Program has as its major objectives the improvement of reading skills for children experiencing reading difficulties, and assistance for classroom teachers in the teaching of reading. The program served approximately 800 students in grades three to four in seven schools. The staff consisted of one coordinator, 14 reading teachers and approximately 20 educational assistants who serve as tutors on a part-time basis. Within each of the seven schools, two reading teachers and three tutors serviced at least 100 pupils.

The program consisted of three components: small group teaching, demonstration and/or team teaching, and individual tutoring.

The small group teaching consisted of approximately ten children who met three times a week for about 45 minutes per session with the reading teacher. The emphasis is on the remediation of specific reading deficiencies through a skills approach.

The demonstration and/or team teaching component included a class-

room teacher as either an observer or team participant and the reading teacher as the trainer. In this setting the reading teacher either demonstrated the teaching of a reading skill to the classroom teacher using the entire class, or served as half of a team with the classroom teacher in planning and carrying out a reading lesson. In each school, four classroom teachers are involved in this activity on a daily basis.

The educational assistants who serve as tutors, work with children on a one-to-one basis under the direction of the reading teacher.

The tutors and the reading teachers meet one period a week to plan individual activities for those children who are selected for this component of the probram. Tutors and selected children work on a daily basis.

As a part of the Diagnostic Reading Program, in-service training was provided for the reading teachers by the Program Coordinator on a weekly basis.

Program Objectives

The major objective of the program was to show significant positive changes in reading achievement and basic reading skills for those children who were retarded in reading ability and lacked basic reading skills.

A second objective of the program was to provide teacher training through demonstration lessons of reading skills to the classroom teacher.

Evaluation Objectives and Procedures

The focus of the evaluation was on the degree to which the major objectives of the program were implemented.

The major evaluation objectives were:

1. To determine to what extent the program has increased proficiency in reading.

2. To determine the effectiveness of the teacher training aspect of the program as perceived by the reading teachers and classroom teachers.

3. To evaluate the implementation of the total program as described in the project proposal.

To achieve the above objectives, the following procedures were undertaken:

1. The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test - Level I, Form W was administered as a pretest to approximately 25% of the total population. Form X of this instrument was administered in the spring as a post-test. Because of the lack of adequate control groups, comparisons of changes between the post achievement scores and predicted growth scores derived from the pretest scores were made. For these comparisons the Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Test was used. The data derived by the Historical Rate of Growth method was analyzed by a correlated "t" test. Significance was initially set at .05 level.

Assessment of changes in basic reading skills was measured by the remaining subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Skill areas assessed were: Vocabulary, Auditory Discrimination, Syllabication, Beginning and Ending Sounds, Blending, and Sound Discrimination. Analysis of changes in pre and post test in basic reading skills were determined by a correlated "t" test on pre and post raw scores in the above skill areas.

2. Observation of the three components of the program as they were carried out in the seven participating schools. An Observer Checklist (see Appendix A) was used for this activity.

3. Questionnaires were distributed to the Project Coordinators, reading teachers, classroom teachers and principals to assess their perceptions and reactions to all three components of the Diagnostic Reading Program (see Appendix B).

Implementation of Program

Each of the seven schools was observed by a member of the evaluation team during the Fall and Spring terms. These observations plus interviews with the program coordinator and reading teachers indicated that the program as described was implemented in all of the participating schools.

The children were selected from the whole classes for small group work and tutorial work. Diagnostic instruments were employed to assess reading deficiencies and children were appropriately grouped for instruction. In addition, individual students with special needs were selected for work with the tutors. Demonstration/team teaching was observed in all of the schools.

Observer comments in each of the seven areas (see Appendix A) indicated variability across the seven schools. Physical facilities varied from individual classrooms for each reading teacher, to half classrooms specifically for the reading program, to the use of storage closets and hallway alcoves. The responsibility of providing space for the Diagnostic Reading Program rested with the principal in each individual school. In general, the reading teachers exercised great ingenuity in overcoming the shortcomings of those facilities that were inadequate. However, an additional burden was placed upon these reading teachers because of the lack of a chalkboard and storage facilities.

In general, a wide variety of materials was provided for the program. These included software such as pupil workbooks, trade books, magazines, and hardware consisting of tape recorders, listening centers, and other audio-visual projection devices. In addition, teacher prepared materials were utilized. Not all of these materials were available at the beginning of the year but did arrive during the course of the year. For the most part, these materials were used to apply the reading skills that were taught and to provide for independent activities.

There was ample evidence that planning of reading skill lessons was

an on-going activity. However, it was observed that variability did exist in the degree to which the teachers could successfully isolate the skill to teach in order to remediate a diagnosed deficiency. There appears to be a relationship between the prior educational training of the reading teachers and their ability to plan and execute a reading skills lesson. Skill lessons tended to emphasize basic phonics, literal meaning, and some inferential reading skills.

It was observed that both pupils and reading teachers in the small groups shared enthusiasm for the program. Classroom teachers welcomed the team teaching aspect of the program and appeared to benefit from the demonstration lessons. The tutors were an integral part of the program in that they reinforced the reading skills under the supervision of the reading teachers. In addition they provided the individual contact which is so important to a retarded reader and tended to serve as models for oral language development.

Pupil Evaluation

As indicated earlier, no control group was available for the purpose of comparisons of gains in reading. The procedure adopted, therefore, was to compare the changes between the post achievement scores and predicted growth scores derived from the pretest scores. For these comparisons the Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Test was used. Grade level scores were used for the analyses (see Table 1).

It will be noted that the gains reported in Table 1 are highly significant in both grades three and four. Using the Historical Growth Method, the data was analyzed by a correlated "t" test. As noted in

TABLE 1

DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM

COMPREHENSION SUBTEST - SDRT

MEANS, SD AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		Pre Test		Predicted Post Test		Post Teat		Dif.[a]			
Grade	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	df	t	Sig.
3	65	1.66	.37	1.86	.56	2.37	.42	.51	64	6.50	.001
4	185	2.10	.53	2.23	.85	2.67	.47	.44	184	8.59	.001

[a]Difference is between predicted post test, mean and post test mean.

Table 1 the difference score is approximately equal to one standard deviation of the post test score. Although significance was initially set at the .05 level, the significance exceeded the .001 level.

Although meaningful and substantial gains were reported in the area of comprehension, it is important to note that these students in both grades three and four are still quite deficient in reading as they are still scoring below the norm. This indicates a need for continuing remediation in this area.

Assessment of changes in basic reading skills was measured by the subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test as noted in Tables 2 and 3. Analysis of changes in the pre and post tests in basic reading skills were determined by a correlated "t" test on pre and post raw scores.

Subtests as listed in Tables 2 and 3 do not indicate the hierarchical nature of the skills. The Vocabulary Subtest is a measure of listening vocabulary and as such is not related to silent reading comprehension or the decoding skills. The decoding skills arranged in order of difficulty are as follows: Auditory Discrimination, Beginning and Ending Sounds, Sound Discrimination, Syllabication and Blending. Therefore, in Grade 3, the subtests on Syllabication and Blending were not administered to the total sample population as they were deemed too difficult.

Although the growth in the vocabulary subtest is statistically significant in Grade 3 it is less than one standard deviation. The gains in all of the other subtests exceed one standard deviation and therefore are highly meaningful as well as significant. These data tend to reflect the

TABLE 2

DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM

MEANS AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

GRADE 3

Subtest	N[a]	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD	Dif. Mean	df	t	Sig.
Vocabulary	63	12.44	3.03	14.97	4.27	2.52	62	4.19	.001
Auditory Discrimination	62	19.05	10.05	33.68	9.20	14.63	61	11.70	.001
Syllabication	48	7.40	2.66	12.10	4.02	4.70	47	7.94	.001
Beginning and Ending Sounds	62	16.42	5.46	25.31	5.91	8.89	61	12.20	.001
Blending	48	9.85	6.30	22.54	6.27	12.69	47	14.72	.001
Sound Discrimination	61	10.23	4.22	19.02	6.67	8.75	60	10.20	.001

[a]Indicates number of pupils to whom a specific subtest was administered.

TABLE 3

DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM

MEANS AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

GRADE 4

Subtest	N[a]	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD	Dif. Mean	df	t	Sig.
Vocabulary	186	13.48	4.01	17.85	5.65	4.38	185	11.49	.001
Auditory Discrimination	183	21.97	9.30	33.87	8.98	11.90	182	14.74	.001
Syllabication	187	11.35	5.81	13.51	5.71	2.16	186	4.96	.001
Beginning and Ending Sounds	179	18.58	6.64	25.23	6.15	7.66	178	17.87	.001
Blending	184	14.07	8.02	22.20	8.28	8.14	183	15.75	.001
Sound Discrimination	172	14.20	5.98	18.45	7.14	4.25	171	8.43	.001

[a]Indicates number of pupils to whom a specific subtest was administered.

emphasis in the skill teaching in that oral language communication (vocabulary development) was not stressed to the same degree as were the phonic skills.

The data for Grade 4 does not indicate any specific trends relative to the teaching strategies that were employed. In examining the growth scores no consistency was found relative to the hierarchical order of the reading skills being developed. This may reflect the nature of the pupil population in that a high proportion of the pupils were non-native English speaking. However, growth in all areas was statistically significant. The growth in the basic phonic skills of Auditory Discrimination, Beginning and Ending Sounds, and Blending was highly meaningful as well as significant in that the mean growth in each subtest score exceeded one standard deviation.

Staff Evaluation of the Program

Questionnaires for the evaluation of the reading program were submitted to the Project Coordinators, the reading teachers, the classroom teachers, and the principals in the schools participating in the program. The respondents were asked to rate various aspects of the program on a five-point scale from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory."

In addition to the rating scales, corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, and principals who had participated in previous funded reading programs were asked to compare this year's program with last year's program. Participants were also asked whether they would be interested in participating in a similar program again. It was hoped in this way to assess the general degree of satisfaction of the pro-

fessional staff with the program. Respondents were also urged to make comments and recommendations that they wished to make, thus covering aspects that may have been overlooked in the rating scale. An analysis of these data follows:

Reading Teachers. A total of 11 reading teachers rated fifteen aspects of the program. In general, the reading teachers' evaluation of the program was favorable. All fifteen aspects were rated above "average". It should be noted that the reading teachers felt that the program objectives were both clear and appropriate and that the materials provided enabled them to carry out the program objectives.

In speaking with the reading teachers it was apparent that they were very satisfied with the organization of the program which permitted them to work with the retarded readers in both a normal classroom setting and in small groups. They felt that it was especially helpful to have tutors available to work with those pupils who needed additional reinforcement beyond what was offered in the small group.

In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of the program, the reading teachers were asked to evaluate the supportive personnel which included the tutors assigned to the program and the guidance services in the school (see Appendix B). The 11 reading teachers who responded to this questionnaire rated the tutors as above average (M = 4.0). In general they preferred full-time instead of part-time tutors to ease scheduling problems and to allow for an increase in the numbers of pupils the tutors could work with. The reading teachers expressed a desire to have more time to plan and supervise the work of the tutors.

In addition they felt more time and/or personnel should be provided for in-service training of tutors.

The reaction of the reading teachers to the support they received from the guidance personnel varied. In three of the cases where guidance support was available, it was considered "very helpful". In two cases where guidance support was available it was considered "not helpful". In the remaining six evaluations guidance help was not available or barely available.

Reading Coordinator. An interview was conducted with the Reading Coordinator to elicit her evaluation of the program. She rated all 11 items as "above average" or "very satisfactory" (see Appendix B). In reference to the selection procedures of pupils (item a.), she indicated that they varied from school to school dependent upon the needs of the individual schools as determined by the school administration. The project coordinator conducted weekly in-service training sessions for the Reading Teachers. These sessions emphasized diagnostic techniques, specific skill teaching procedures and methods to be used in the training of the tutors. In addition to these training sessions, the Reading Coordinator conducted both formal and informal supervision of the Reading Teachers and tutors. Reading training sessions incorporated the knowledge gained from the field supervision. Reading Teachers valued this training and used part of this time to discuss individual school and teaching problems. The Reading Coordinator stated that the strengths of the program included the highly professional cooperation of the reading team and the high caliber interaction of the team personnel with the school staff. Despite

the difficulties the lines of communication were kept open among principal, classroom teachers, the Project Coordinator and team personnel. In general, the Project Coordinator considered this year's program more effective than the 1971-1972 program.

Classroom Teachers. The classroom teachers who were teamed with the reading teachers were asked to evaluate 11 aspects of the reading program on a five-point scale from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory" (see Appendix B). Thirty-two responses were returned to the evaluation team.

With the exception of one teacher all items were rated satisfactory or above. Organization, scheduling, and time allocated were rated barely satisfactory by this one teacher. Twenty-seven of the teachers indicated that they were interested in participating in a similar program next year. Five teachers were "not sure" and noted some possible modifications.

The generally favorable responses of the classroom teachers to the reading program may be noted in a sampling of teacher's comments.

> "I feel this program is extremely worthwhile and should be continued. On the whole, children have shown considerable progress in reading and it has carried over to other areas."
>
> "I feel that this program was an extraordinary help to the children and to myself."
>
> "I feel the instruction was highly beneficial to the students. The people involved worked very hard in setting up the program and cooperated fully with the teachers in the classroom. The liaison and rapport were excellent. More important, however, was the fact that the pupils showed improvements and seemed to enjoy the program."
>
> "In my class, the program ran very smoothly. The

children enjoyed it; worked willingly and seemed to attach no stigma to being in a corrective reading program."

Principals. The principals in all of the diagnostic reading services were asked to rate 14 areas pertaining to the program (see Appendix B). All seven principals responded to the questionnaire. Six of the principals rated all 14 items average or above. In comparing this year's program to last year's program these six principals indicated that the 1972-73 program was superior to the 1971-72 program and that they were interested in participating in the same program next year.

One principal rated four itemas as below average (a, b, c, e). These items generally dealt with the organization of the program and the clarity of program objectives. It would appear from our observations that because of the homogeneous classroom organization in this school retarded readers were grouped with non-English speaking pupils and therefore the program as set up was not applicable to approximately half the pupil population. In addition, observation noted the inadequacies of the physical facilities in this school in that one reading teacher worked in the hall. This principal indicated that he does not wish to participate in this program again.

A sampling of principals' comments reflect their general attitude toward the program.

"The Reading Supervisor at the District has been most cooperative with our school and is to be commended for the assistance she has given us."

"Our program has been very effective as reflected in the growth shown by pupils who were assisted."

"The questionnaire makes no reference to the tutoring component of the program. I believe this was a very worthwhile part of the Diagnostic Reading Program."

> "Even more important, perhaps, is the change in attitude evidenced by the pupils in the program. From being 'anti-reading' they have become enthusiastic, interested and confident of their ability to succeed."

Other comments indicate that the principals would prefer greater flexibility in programming, control over selection of students and continuation of the program in the upper grades for those pupils who were in the program this year.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The Diagnostic Reading Program, as instituted in District 15, conformed with the project proposal funded under State Urban Education. The major objectives of the program were (1) to show significant positive changes in reading achievement and basic reading skills for those children who are retarded in reading ability and (2) to provide teacher training through demonstration lessons for the classroom teacher. The program consisted of three components: small group teaching, demonstration and/or team teaching and individual tutoring.

Formal evaluation of the program began early in November. Evaluation focused on the degree to which the objectives of the program were met. Evaluation procedures included site visits to all of the seven schools, an analysis of data of reading tests administered to a random sample of 250 pupils and an analysis of responses from the staff to rating scales and questionnaires designed to assess their reactions to and perceptions of the program. This final report includes an evaluation of the projects' implementation, and assessment of the project's effectiveness in increasing reading ability and an evaluation of the program by the staff participants.

Findings

Analysis of the data collected yielded the following findings:

1. Observation of the program in operation indicated that the program was implemented as outlined in the proposal and was functioning very satisfactorily.

2. Analyses of comprehension test scores using the Historical Rate of Growth formula indicated that growth was both highly statistically significant and meaningful. In both Grades 3 and 4 about one-year beyond the predicted growth was achieved.

3. Analysis of the subtests of basic reading skills in Grade 3 indicated highly meaningful and statistical significant gains with the exception of Vocabulary subtest which was statistically significant but not meaningful.

4. Analysis of the subtests of basic reading skills in Grade 4 indicated statistical significance in all areas, but was meaningful only in Auditory Discrimination, Beginning and Ending Sounds and Blending. In these three areas the mean gain exceeded one standard deviation.

5. In general, ratings by the staff indicated satisfaction with the program and they expressed interest in participating in a similar program next year.

Recommendations

In conclusion, on the basis of site observations, analysis of reading test data and reactions of the staff, the evaluators consider the Diagnostic Reading Program effective in accomplishing its major goals. It is, therefore, recommended that this program be recycled in the 1973-

1974 school year.

Some recommendations which might increase the effectiveness of the program follow:

1. Continue to emphasize teacher training for the classroom teacher by the reading teacher recognizing that the team approach is a major strength of the program.

2. Urge the reading teachers to include a variety of approaches and materials with the recognition that a language-experience approach would be most appropriate for those children whose oral language is linguistically different from standard English.

3. Encourage the reading teacher to select natural reading situations (stories, magazines, newspapers) for application of the skill taught and as a culminating activity.

4. Increase the use of different level and/or skill materials in the individualization of instruction in the small groups within a group.

5. Continue evaluation and assessment of individual pupil needs on a continuous on-going basis with chart or journal record keeping.

6. Consider an increase in the time allotted the reading teachers for planning the reading activities carried out by the tutors so that the team approach is further enhanced.

7. Urge school principals to upgrade those physical facilities that are inadequate.

8. Extend the program one grade higher so that those pupils who continue to need remediation can be serviced in an attempt to reach their

potential.

9. Select reading personnel with specific training in diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties. Evaluators noted the effectiveness of those reading teachers who were highly trained.

In addition to the above recommendations which are specific to the program, we strongly recommend that the school administrators consider the advantages of heterogeneous classroom grouping in their schools. As long as retarded readers are being supported by an individualized reading program, research literature has shown the stimulation and increased teacher expectations derived from heterogeneous grouping has an impact on the learning progress of these pupils.

MULTI-MEDIA READING PROGRAM

Program Description

The Multi-Media Program had as its major objective the improvement of reading skills for children with reading difficulties by supplementing their regular classroom reading program with laboratory experiences. The program served approximately 1,000 students in six schools. The staff consisted of 13 funded reading teachers and eleven educational assistants. The schools in the program operated either a Language Laboratory Center (LLC) using skill materials from a variety of publishers and some audio-visual materials, and/or an Educational Development Laboratory (EDL). In those schools designated as EDL, the staff received special training by EDL to implement the program.

Approximately 30 students worked in the laboratory four to five times each week for at least 30 minutes each session. Students were pro-

grammed for work in skill materials with small groups or on a one-to-one basis.

The classroom teacher, the reading teacher and the educational assistants worked as a team in planning and supervising the progress of the students.

Program Objective

The major objective of the program was to show significant positive changes in reading achievement.

Evaluation Objectives and Procedures

The major evaluation objectives were:

1. To determine to what extent the program has increased proficiency in reading.

2. To evaluate the implementation of the program as described in the project proposal.

To achieve the above objectives, the following procedures were undertaken:

1. The Metropolitan Achievement Test was administered as a pre-test to approximately 30% of the total population. An alternate form of this test was administered in the Spring as a posttest. Because of the lack of adequate control groups, comparisons of changes between the post achievement scores and predicted growth scores derived from the pretest scores were made. The data derived by the Historical Rate of Growth Method was analyzed by a correlated "t" test. Significancewas initially set at the .05 level.

2. Observation of the program as it was carried out in the four selected schools. An Observer Checklist (see Appendix A) was used for this activity.

3. Questionnaires were distributed to the participants of the program to assess their perceptions and reactions to the Multi-Media Program.

Implementation of the Program

Of the six schools that were funded for Multi-Media laboratories,

four were selected for observation by the evaluation team. Three of these schools were elementary schools, and one was a junior high school. The specific programs they implemented were as follows:

1. Elementary School - Language Laboratory Center (LLC)
2. Elementary School - Educational Development Laboratory (EDL)
3. Elementary School - LLC and EDL
4. Junior High School - LLC

In both the elementary schools and the junior high schools, whole classes were programmed for the Multi-Media laboratories. In the elementary schools, the LLC consisted of skill materials from a variety of publishers selected by the teacher to meet the specific skill needs of the pupils. The pupils worked either individually or in small groups under the direct supervision of the reading teacher, the classroom teacher or the para-professional. The EDL program was installed and operated as designed by the publishers and utilized the services of the reading teacher, the classroom teacher and the para-professionals. In the junior high school, the Reading Plus System formed the basis of the LLC utilizing diagnostic placement tests and a variety of publisher's materials. Students worked independently, and were assisted and checked by the teacher and para-professional. Observation indicated that the strength of the Reading Plus System for this age level was its provision for a self-controlled learning environment.

Observations of the LLC in the elementary schools indicated that the teachers were meeting the individual reading skill needs of the pupils as previously diagnosed. There was evidence of teacher planning

for small group instruction and follow-up activities in the regular classroom. This was greatly facilitated by the direct participation of the classroom teacher in the LLC. Students and staff exhibited enthusiasm for the program.

In contrast, the EDL program offered a global approach which did not appear to differentiate among the skill needs of the individual students. Some activities such as the "eye warm-ups" were presented to the entire class without previous demonstrated need or physical ability to sustain this activity. The staff in the EDL was occupied primarily in the distribution of materials and the operation of the various machines. There was little evidence of teacher planning other than what was prescribed in the EDL manual. The nature of the program which was highly receptive rather than expressive made it impossible to assess pupil reaction to the material and the staff.

Pupil Evaluation

As indicated earlier, no control group was available for the purpose of comparisons of gains in reading. The procedure adopted, therefore, was to compare the changes between the post achievement scores and predicted growth scores derived from the pre-test scores. For these comparisons the Metropolitan Achievement Test - Reading was used. Grade level scores were used for the analyses (see Table 4).

It will be noted that the gains reported in Table 4 were significant, with the exception of Grade 5, at the .001 level. The gains in Grade 3 and 4 were statistically significant and exceeded the predicted gain by approximately three months. In grades 6 and 9, the results are both

TABLE 4

MULTI-MEDIA PROGRAM

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST - READING

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Posttest		Dif.[a]			
Grade	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	df	t	Sig.
3	42	2.20	.59	2.63	.80	2.88	.70	.26	41	4.66	.001
4	104	2.64	.63	3.02	.77	3.36	.82	.35	103	6.63	.001
5	49	3.58	.86	4.03	1.01	4.07	.96	.04	48	.25	n.s.
6	22	5.73	1.60	6.39	1.83	7.21	1.36	.82	21	4.91	.001
9	90	5.20	.89	5.57	.97	6.73	1.09	1.16	89	11.00	.001

[a]Difference is between predicted posttest mean and posttest mean.

highly significant and meaningful, as the difference scores exceeded one standard deviation and growth was approximately one year beyond predicted growth.

The data seems to be consistent with the thrust of the programs. In Grade 5, in which the results were non-significant, EDL was the major program and as previously indicated did not attack the specific skill weaknesses of the individual students.

Staff Evaluations

Although reactions of the staff to a Multi-Media Program were requested (questionnaires and rating scales provided) responses were received from only one school. Therefore, analyses were not possible.

Summary, Recommendations and Findings

The Multi-Media Program as instituted in District 15 conformed with the project proposal funded under State Urban Education. The major objective of the program was to improve the reading skills of retarded readers by supplementing their regular classroom reading program with laboratory experiences.

Formal evaluation of the program began in early November. Evaluation procedures included site visits to four of the participating schools and an analysis of data of reading tests administered to a random sample of 307 pupils.

This final report includes an evaluation of the project implementation and an assessment of the projects' effectiveness in increasing reading ability.

Findings

Analysis of the data collected yielded the following findings:

1. Observation of the program in operation indicated that the program was implemented and functioning as outlined in the proposal.

2. An analysis of reading test scores using the Historical Reading Growth formula indicated statistically significant differences in Grades 3 and 4 with growth beyond predicted levels. In Grades 6 and 9, the results were both highly significant and meaningful as the difference scores exceed one standard deviation and growth was approximately one year above prediction. In Grade 5 the results were non-significant.

Recommendations

In conclusion, on the basis of site observations and reading test data, the evaluators consider the Multi-Media Program only partially effective in accomplishing its major goal. Although we realize the large amount of funds expended for the EDL program, we recommend that this program not be recycled in the 1973-74 school year in its present form. It is recommended that the Language Laboratory Centers be continued in the 1973-74 school year.

The following recommendations may help to increase the effectiveness of the LLC.

1. Select reading personnel with specific training in diagnostic and remediation of reading difficulties. Evaluators noted the effectiveness of those reading teachers who were highly trained.

2. Hire a minimum of one paraprofessional for each reading teacher to facilitate and augment the program.

3. Set-up a number of informal group meetings so that the reading teachers can share and plan activities.

In addition to the above it is suggested that the school administrators consider using the reading teachers and the LLC as a resource for the classroom teachers who are not participating in the program. In this way training in the teaching of reading will be disseminated to the total school staff.

It is recommended that the EDL program be continued only if the following changes are instituted:

1. Consider the EDL program and its accompanying materials as application activities for an on-going skills developing program.

2. Initiate the program with an intensive diagnostic work-up of each pupil selected and use only those portions of the EDL program which are applicable to a particular student need.

3. Incorporate a teacher planned reading skills program using both small groups and individual instruction with an emphasis on direct teaching.

4. Use those materials of EDL which are meant to be consumable as such because writing on separate answer sheets changes the task from reading to writing and in addition may be misleading.

GUIDANCE AIDES

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Guidance Aides program was based in 11 schools in District 15, in Brooklyn. Participating in the program were seven elementary schools (PS 1, 10, 15, 94, 107, 172, and 261); one intermediate school (IS 88); and three junior high schools (JHS 51, 136, and 142). One Guidance Aide was assigned to each of these schools as an assistant to the school guidance counselors in their work with educationally and economically disadvantaged children.

The Aides were recruited by school principals and the Supervisor of Guidance in District 15. They were young adults well known to each of the immediate communities to which they were assigned. Many of them had previously worked as paid or volunteer workers in the schools, carrying out assignments which were different than those which they were required to do in the present program. Their educational backgrounds ranged from two years of high school to enrollment in community college programs. Their various titles - Family Workers (4), Family Workers A (5), and Family Assistants (2) were designations based upon educational background and experience. The Guidance Aides were employed with the understanding that the program provided them with an opportunity to upgrade themselves educationally; with further training they might be able to gain full professional status in the general area of guidance.

The Aides worked directly under school guidance counselors, with overall supervision being given by the Supervisor of Guidance in District

15. They worked with parents and children individually and in small groups. Their specific duties included the following activities:

Assisting the counselor with clerical assignments

Interviewing individual children

Accompanying children to clinics

Accompanying children and parents to new schools to which the former had been transferred

Assisting counselors with bi-lingual interviews

Helping to fill out working papers for students

Answering the telephone in the Guidance Office

Acting as receptionist in the Guidance Office

Escorting children from their classrooms to the counselor

Making home visits, with counselors

Helping the counselors in record keeping

In addition, each Guidance Aide was assigned a caseload of 30 children who were seen regularly, and upon those occasions of crisis or special difficulties. They saw approximately one-third of their "special" children each week, telling them stories or reading to them, playing games, assisting with a difficult school assignment, giving them the support of an interested adult.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

The objectives of the Guidance Aides Program were to provide assistance to the guidance counselors, to relieve them of many routine duties, and to free the counselors for increased educational and vocational counseling activities.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The original evaluation objectives were to determine whether, in schools to which Guidance Aides were assigned, guidance counselors were able to carry out their professional duties more effectively than in schools with no Guidance Aides (controls). In March, 1973, a directive issued in Albany by the Bureau of Urban and Community Affairs, Program Evaluation Section, indicated that the evaluation objectives were considered deficient in terms of later priorities which stressed the measurement of changes in student achievement. Although the objectives of the Guidance Aides program were not directly concerned with facilitating pupil achievement in academic areas, the evaluation team was asked to revise its design and objectives in order to determine whether or not pupils who received the services of the Guidance Aides showed significant gains in reading achievement from April 1972 to April 1973. The revised evaluation objective was restated, as follows:

> To evaluate gains in reading test scores from April 1972 to April 1973 through the application of inferential statistics in order to determine whether or not achievement changes were greater than might be expected solely on the basis of classroom instruction.

FINDINGS

Members of the evaluation team observed and interviewed the 11 Guidance Aides in the participating schools. Seven aides were visited once, and two visits were made to the remaining four Aides. School principals, assistant principals, and guidance counselors were interviewed in each of the 11 schools. Five conferences were held with the District 15 Supervisor of Guidance, and three training sessions (Guidance Aides)

conducted by the Supervisor of Guidance were observed.

The observations of the evaluation team confirmed the fact that the program functioned throughout the year in terms of its objectives. The Aides carried on their duties as described in an earlier section of this report. They kept daily logs of their activities, which contained childrens' names, the presenting problems, and the interventions which were made. All of the Aides had assigned caseloads of children who needed special attention or support, and these children were seen on a regular basis. The daily logs showed that the Aides consulted regularly with the counselors on their work with the children, and that they were effective in bringing about positive changes in behavior in their "clients". The Aides demonstrated remarkable competence in the performance of their duties, considering that they were paraprofessionals with limited education and training for their specific assignments.

It was interesting to observe how the Aides were accepted by the teachers and school administrators, how they blended in to the school as a social institution. They developed friendly relationships with the policeman on the corner, the attendance teacher, and all members of the professional staff; they were members of the school family. In their conferences with parents and children they were patient and understanding and treated all people with dignity and respect.

Principals, assistant principals, teachers, and guidance counselors were enthusiastic about the work of the Guidance Aides. No reservations were expressed in any school; to the contrary everyone expressed the wish that this program could be extended and more Guidance Aides could be re-

cruited and employed.

Counselors in the schools involved themselves in the training of the Aides, both in formal sessions each week, and in informal ways almost daily when the problems of certain children were discussed. The on-the-job development of the Aides grew out of their close working relationships with their counselors. Additional training was given in monthly three-hour sessions conducted by the Supervisor of Guidance of the district. The agenda for these meetings ranged from the discussion of behavior disorders, parent-child relationships, how to interview, how to listen to parents and children, how to detect signs of learning disabilities in the children with whom the Aides worked. Outside speakers from clinics and various bureaus of the Board of Education participated in some of these discussions. In one training session observed by the evaluation team, the Supervisor of Guidance discussed items contained in the daily or monthly logs of the Aides. Structured observations of four training sessions were made by a member of the evaluation team; the average ratings of the four sessions are presented in Table 1.

All of the Guidance Aides availed themselves of career-ladder opportunities during the summer of 1972 or during the past academic year. Some continued to complete their high school work, or studied in community colleges. At the end of the academic year four Aides announced that their applications for admission to community colleges had been accepted.

The specific evaluation objective described earlier in this report was implemented by a comparison of the April 1972-1973 combined reading

TABLE 1

GUIDANCE AIDES PROGRAM

STRUCTURED OBSERVATIONS OF

STAFF TRAINING SESSIONS

1. Trainer Support

1	2	3	4	5
ignores, discourages responses				reflects, encourages praises responses

2. Patient Understanding

1	2	3	4	5
short, impatient				shows patience with Aides

3. Rapport with Aides

1	2	3	4	5
social distance maintained				warm, friendly relationship

4. Emotional climate

1	2	3	4	5
tense, or "frozen" atmosphere				relaxed, Aides reacting positively to Trainer

5. Agenda

1	2	3	4	5
lacking relevance diffuse				appropriate to mission

6. Trainer Preparation

1	2	3	4	5
poorly organized, confused				well organized, well prepared

comprehension and vocabulary scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test on children who comprised the caseloads of the Guidance Aides. Data are presented on 157 children from 11 schools. This sample includes all children (1) on whom test scores from both years were available; (2) who were not classified as mental retardates; and (3) had sufficient facility with the English language to understand the test instructions and were able to read the test items. Important variables were chronological age and number of years of post-kindergarten schooling. The results are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION AND T RATIO
COMPARISONS OF 1972-73 READING SCORES
(CHILDREN SEEN REGULARLY BY
GUIDANCE AIDES)
N = 157

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Diff.	T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.
Pretest	3.2081	1.531				
Post-test	4.3497	1.891	.8890	12.24	156	.001
Predicted Post-test	3.4607	1.646				

It will be seen that the post-test mean is significantly greater than the predicted post-test mean. Children who comprised the caseloads of the Guidance Aides gained significantly in their reading test scores over what would have been predicted by an additional year of schooling.

SUMMARY

The Guidance Aides program in District 15, Brooklyn was centered in seven elementary schools, one intermediate school and three junior high schools. Guidance Aides were assigned to these schools to assist the regular guidance counselors in their work with educationally and economically disadvantaged children and their parents. The educational backgrounds of the Aides ranged from two years of high school to community college experience. Guidance Aides assisted the counselors in a variety of ways: they accompanied children to clinics or to newly assigned schools; they interviewed Spanish speaking parents; they acted as receptionists, answered the telephone, assisted in filing records, made visits to the homes of children, and worked individually with children who needed emotional and educational support. Their services were enthusiastically evaluated by teachers and school administrators who expressed a strong interest in having the program continued and even extended.

Children comprising the caseloads of the Guidance Aides gained significantly in reading achievement in one year in comparison to their predicted post-test scores. Their activities were supervised by the school guidance counselors, with the responsibility for the overall direction of the program assigned to the Supervisor of Guidance in District 15. The evaluation team judges that this program is functioning effec-

ively in line with the program objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Guidance Aides program in District 15 is very effective in its operation, and every attempt should be made to recycle it for the next academic year.

2. Because of the busy schedules and the regular obligations of school counselors and the Supervisor of Guidance in District 15, a full-time supervisory person should be assigned to direct the activities of the Aides.

RETURN TO SCHOOL PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The program consisted of five instructional units which functioned apart from the regular school setting. It was designed for those students who did not achieve well in the regular classroom, were frequently truant and showed antisocial behavior.

The basic objective of the program was to return these students to a regular classroom. It was felt that this could be achieved by improving the child's reading and mathematical skills, by improving his self concept, by promoting a more positive attitude toward school, and by improving the child's participation in classroom activities.

Participating Schools

At the end of the year there were 130 students participating in this program. The following schools were involved:

J.H.S. 136K	Dewey Prep	26 students
I.S. 88K	Annex	29 students
I.S. 293	Annex	27 students
J.H.S. 142	Stranahan Prep	23 students
J.H.S. 51	Academy	25 students
	Total	130 students

Selection of Students

The students were generally recommended for participation in the program by teachers, guidance counselors, and deans. They were selected by the teachers in each project after being interviewed by them. Cri-

teria for selection were that they were several years behind in reading, that there was hope for success for them in a more individualized instructional setting. About 40 students had attended the previous year in the program.

Staffing

Every project was staffed by two teachers and two paraprofessionals. The teachers were drawn from the regular staff of the participating school on a voluntary basis. The paraprofessionals were members of the community. An effort was made to have two men and two women on the team.

During the second part of the year a coordinator for the five projects was appointed.

Activities

The main emphasis of all five projects focused on reading instruction followed by instruction in mathematics. Typically, instruction took place in small groups with tutorial help given to individual students. The kinds of activities varied from project to project, ranging from children working by themselves in learning centers, listening to tapes, using typewriters, to large group instruction. The majority of classes returned to their schools for lunch, gym, shop and assemblies. In some cases, shop and gym were taught by the teachers in the program. Some children returned to their school for afternoon basketball games. Most of the classes went on several field trips, e.g., visiting factories, Yankee Stadium, Planetarium, Hall of Fame, etc.

Facilities and Materials

There was a great variety in the physical facilities of the five

projects. The three of the projects which were located in church Sunday school rooms seemed to have more favorable facilities for the activities of the program. Often, several rooms or cubicles were available for learning centers, and gym and kitchen facilities allowed for an enrichment of learning activities. The other two projects were located in regular classrooms in the school's annex.

Materials

Some of the projects were relying mainly on standard textbooks. Others had purchased paperbacks with high interest value and low skills. Some centers had tape recorders for use by the students, cassette labs for phonics instruction, and elementary reading kits.

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

The project objectives were changed as depicted in the addition to the proposal. In particular, instead of focusing on a child's change in self concept, promoting a more positive attitude toward school, and improving the child's participation in the classroom, the program was evaluated on the basis of comparing April 1973 reading scores with April 1972 reading scores.

Sample

Although there were 130 students on the register of the five projects, only 102 scores of the April 1973 MAT test were received. Of these, only 66 scores were usable because no reports of the April 1972 MAT test were available.

The distribution of these 66 students according to their grade in school is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO GRADE

Grade	Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
6	9	13.6
7	11	16.7
8	20	30.3
9	26	39.4
Total	66	100.0

In order to evaluate the students' progress in reading, the length of time of attendance in school was ascertained. The distribution of the 66 students with respect to the number of years they spent in school is shown in Table 2.

Evaluation Instrument

According to the change in evaluation procedure, the Return to School Program was to be evaluated solely on the basis of reading progress. Therefore, the MAT for Reading was administered to the students in April 1973.

Statistical Treatment

On the basis of a formula submitted by the New York State Education Department in Albany, April 1972, scores were to be used to predict April 1973 scores on the basis of a student's number of years attending school.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF YEARS IN SCHOOL

Years in School	Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
6	3	4.5
7	7	10.6
8	16	24.2
9	32	48.5
10	7	10.6
11	1	1.5
Total	66	100.0

That predicted score was then to be compared with the actual achieved score in April 1973.

RESULTS

The means of the scores on the MAT for April 1972, April 1973, and predicted April 1973 scores are shown in Table 3.

A t-test was computed to compare the means of scores on the MAT for April 1973 and predicted April 1973 scores. This is shown in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that students in the program gained about 1/3 of a year or 4 months in reading ability over and above the predicted achievement.

TABLE 3

MEANS OF SCORES ON MAT FOR APRIL 1972, APRIL 1973 AND PREDICTED APRIL 1973 SCORES

MAT	Mean	S.D.
April 1972	4.382	1.586
Predicted April 1973	4.658	1.702
April 1973	5.017	1.973

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF MEANS BETWEEN APRIL 1973 AND PREDICTED APRIL 1973 SCORES

MAT	N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	Two-tail Probability
April 1973	66	5.017	1.793			
Predicted April 1973	66	4.658	1.702			
Difference in Means		.359		2.49	65	.015

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The gain in reading ability shows that students improved beyond what one would have expected if they had remained in a regular classroom. However, there is no guarantee that these children would have achieved even the predicted score in a regular classroom setting.

Comparing the April 1973 scores with the April 1972 scores a gain of .64, about 2/3 of a year or 8 months was achieved by the students in this program. Although this is below normal for these students it is respectable progress.

These results have to be looked at as rather conservative. The purpose of the program was to return students to the regular classroom. One of the projects reported 8 students returning to the regular classroom. Other reports have not yet been received. However, these students who returned to regular classrooms were not included in the test results. It must be assumed that they had made substantial progress, particularly in reading, and therefore, the reading gain for the Return to School program would have been higher had their test results been included.

A question may be raised to what extent the 66 students in the test sample were representative of the total group. As mentioned before, only those students were selected for the evaluation who had April 1972 and April 1973 scores. There seems to be no obvious bias why some students had or had not a complete set of scores. Therefore, the results can be generalized to the total program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. On the basis of the formal evaluation and informal observations,

it is recommended that the program be continued next year.

2. In order to overcome the felt isolation by the teachers in the project, the use of a coordinator should be continued.

3. An orientation program for teachers and paraprofessionals at the beginning of the year should be instituted.

APPENDIX A

Observer Check List

DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM

New York University
Center for Field Research

Observer Check List

School _____ Grade _____ Group _____

CRT _____ Number Boys _____ Girls _____

Observer _____ Date _____

	Yes	No
A. PHYSICAL FACILITIES		
1. Separate area for reading program	___	___
2. Size of area adequate	___	___
3. Space available for small group work	___	___
4. Space available for individual work	___	___
5. Storage facilities adequate	___	___
6. Chalkboard available	___	___
7. Area attractive	___	___
8. Adequate physical provisions (lights, ventilation, etc.)	___	___
Overall Ratings of Facilities	1 2 3 4 5	
B. MATERIALS		
1. Variety of commercial materials being used.		
a. Workbooks	___	___
b. Trade books	___	___
c. Magazines	___	___
d. Newspapers	___	___
e. Content-area materials	___	___
f. Other	___	___
_____	___	___
_____	___	___
_____	___	___
2. Teacher-made materials	___	___
3. Audio-visual aids	___	___
4. Interest level appropriate to age and maturity of pupils	___	___

	Yes	No
5. Levels of materials suitable for reading ability of pupils	___	___
6. Differentiation between instructional level and independent level materials	___	___
7. Attractive in appearance	___	___
8. Sufficient quantity	___	___

Overall Rating of Materials 1 2 3 4 5

C. EVALUATION

1. Use of Informal Reading Inventory	___	___
2. Use of Gray Oral Reading Test	___	___
3. Standardized Reading Test upon admission to program	___	___
4. Standardized Reading Test at end of school year	___	___
5. On-going informal evaluation of errors in word recognition	___	___
6. On-going diagnosis of errors in comprehension	___	___
7. Evaluation of deficiencies in study skills.	___	___

Overall Rating of Evaluation 1 2 3 4 5

D. PLANNING

1. Evidence of planned sequence in skill development	___	___
2. Planning of skill lessons based on on-going diagnosis of deficiencies	___	___
3. Evidence of planned varied activities for individual and small group needs	___	___
4. Application materials and assignments differentiated for individual and group	___	___

Overall Rating of Planning 1 2 3 4 5

E. TEACHING PROCEDURES

1. Background, readiness, or concept building where appropriate to lesson	___	___
2. Specific skill teaching in		
a. word recognition	___	___
b. comprehension	___	___
c. study skills	___	___
3. Appropriate application following development of a specific skill	___	___

	Yes	No
E. TEACHING PROCEDURES (continued)		
4. Questions differentiated to include various types of meanings -- literal, interpretation, critical evaluation	___	___
5. Grouping of pupils (small group or individual) for special needs	___	___
6. Procedures appropriate to maturity and ability of pupils	___	___
7. Use of class time -- pacing, variety of activities	___	___
8. Integration of reading with content areas . .	___	___

Overall Rating of Teaching Procedures 1 2 3 4 5

F. TEACHER BEHAVIOR		
1. Appears enthusiastic	___	___
2. Establishes a good rapport with pupils (relaxed, informal, confident)	___	___
3. Encourages all pupils to participate	___	___
4. Instills confidence in pupils -- uses positive reinforcement	___	___

Overall Rating of the Teacher 1 2 3 4 5

G. PUPIL PARTICIPATION		
1. Arrive promptly for reading instruction . . .	___	___
2. Actively responds during reading period . . .	___	___
3. Interact with each other	___	___
4. Show interest in independent reading	___	___

Overall Rating of Pupil Interest in Program 1 2 3 4 5

OBSERVER'S COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Staff Evaluation Forms

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

District 15 - State Urban Education Reading Programs

READING TEACHER EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are 16 items about the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   1 = Unsatisfactory, 2 = Barely Satisfactory, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Very Satisfactory

   Please write N.A. if a particular item is NOT APPLICABLE to your program.

Rating

_____ (a) Organization of the program (number of classes, scheduling, etc.)

_____ (b) Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction

_____ (c) Number of pupils in each group

_____ (d) Clarity and appropriateness of the program objectives

_____ (e) Criteria and procedures used in selecting pupils

_____ (f) Physical facilities provided by the school

_____ (g) Materials (workbooks, literature, audio-visual aid, etc.) provided for the instructional program

_____ (h) Materials and instruments supplied for diagnosis and evaluation of pupil strengths and weaknesses in reading

_____ (i) Use of the Informal Reading Inventory to establish reading levels and to evaluate growth in reading

_____ (j) Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading

_____ (k) Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual areas of weakness and strength in reading

_____ (l) Use of the record-keeping system established for the program

Teacher Evaluation (page 2)

Rating

_____ (m) Supervision and assistance provided by the reading coordinator

_____ (n) Cooperation of school personnel

_____ (o) Communication between classroom teacher and yourself

_____ (p) Pupils' attitude toward the reading program

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

District 15 - State Urban Education Reading Program

READING TEACHER EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Supportive services varied according to the funding source for your program. Please answer those questions which apply to you.

1) Tutors

(a) How many tutors were assigned to your reading Program? _____

(b) When did they begin? _____

(c) Approximately how many total hours per week did your tutors assist in the program? _____

(d) Approximately how many total hours per week did you spend supervising or planning with tutors? _____

(e) Please rate the adequacy of the tutors' skills for the program.

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Barely Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Above Average	Very Satisfactory

(f) In terms of the need in your reading program, was the amount of tutor time sufficient?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, please indicate why: _____

_____

_____

_____

Please fell free to write any comments about the tutor program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (page 2)

2. Paraprofessionals

(a) How many paraprofessionals were assigned to your reading program?

_____

(b) When did they begin working? _____

(c) Did the paraprofessionals receive any special training for the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, who provided the training? _____

_____

(d) Please rate the adequacy of the paraprofessionals skills for the program.

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Barely Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Above	Very Satisfactory

(e) Indicate your suggestions for improving the contributions that can be made by paraprofessionals in this Diagnostic Reading Program.

_____

_____

3. Guidance Services

(a) Approximately how many of your corrective reading students received the services of the guidance counselor? _____

(b) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the guidance counselor regarding your students?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Often

(c) How would you rate the quality of your contacts with the guidance counselor? That is, to what degree did his/her services help in leading to the resolution of students' problems?

1	2	3	4	5
Not helpful		Helpful		Very helpful

(d) What suggestions do you have for improving the guidance services provided for students in the reading program?

DISTRICT 15 - DIAGNOSTIC READING

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

Reading Coordinator Interview Form

School _____ Date _____

Reading Supervisor _____ Grade _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are 12 items about the Diagnostic Reading Program. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a 5 in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selection procedures of pupils for the corrective reading program.

_____ b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.

_____ c. Number of pupils in each group.

_____ d. Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading.

_____ e. Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program.

_____ f. Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading.

READING COORDINATOR (page 2)

Rating

_____ g. Use of Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading.

_____ h. Use of Gray Oral Reading Test.

_____ i. Reinforcement of reading program activities in home classroom.

_____ j. Individualization of instruction to meet pupil needs.

_____ k. Cooperation of school personnel.

READING COORDINATOR INTERVIEW FORM

1. Describe nature of in-service training program. (When conducted, number sessions, planning, goals, were by accomplished, special problems).

2. Describe nature of the supervision (how often, formal, informal, teacher reaction).

3. Did you supervise program last year (1971-72)? Compare effectiveness of the programs.

4. General evaluation of program - specific strengths and weaknesses.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

District 15 - State Urban Education Reading Program

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS WITH STUDENTS
IN THE DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM.

Teacher _____ Date _____

School _____

1. How many children in your class(es) participate in the Diagnostic Reading Program this year? _____

2. Instructions: Listed below are 8 items about the Diagnostic Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program:

1	2	3	4	4
Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Above Average	Very Satisfactory

Rating

_____ (a) Selection procedures for pupils in Diagnostic Reading Program

_____ (b) Organization and scheduling of corrective reading instruction

_____ (c) Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction

_____ (d) Communication between corrective reading teacher and yourself

_____ (e) Observable improvement in students' reading performance during regular classroom activities

_____ (f) Students' attitude toward corrective reading classes

_____ (g) Adoption of corrective reading materials, procedures and techniques in the regular classroom program

_____ (h) Parents' reaction to children's participation in the Diagnostic Reading Program.

_____ (i) Value of demonstration lessons provided by reading teacher

_____ (j) Quality of the services provided by corrective reading teacher in your classroom

CLASSROOM TEACHERS (page 2)

3. Did you participate in the Diagnostic Reading Program last year?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. If your answer to 3 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is:

   a. _____ Inferior b. _____ About the same c. _____ Superior

5. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

District 15 - State Urban Education Reading Programs

PRINCIPALS EVALUATION OF THE
DIAGNOSTIC READING PROGRAM

1. Instructions: Listed below are 14 items about the Diagnostic Reading Program. Use the following scale to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of the reading program.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Average	Above Average	Very Satisfactory

Please write N.A. if a particular item is NOT APPLICABLE to your school.

Rating

_____ (a) Organization of the program (including number of classes, scheduling of classes, etc.).

_____ (b) Amount of time allocated to corrective reading instruction

_____ (c) Number of pupils in each reading group

_____ (d) Clarity and appropriateness of the program objectives

_____ (e) Criteria and procedures used in selecting pupils for the program

_____ (f) Physical facilities available for the program

_____ (g) Materials supplied for the instructional program

_____ (h) Materials and instruments supplied and used for diagnosis and evaluation of pupil strengths and weaknesses in reading

_____ (i) In-service training provided for the reading teacher

_____ (j) Quality of the services provided by the corrective reading teacher

_____ (k) Ccoperation of reading teacher with school personnel

_____ (l) Attitude of classroom teachers toward the reading program

_____ (m) Attitude of student participants toward the program

_____ (n) On-going supervision by the reading coordinator

PRINCIPALS EVALUATION (page 2)

2. Did your school participate in the Diagnostic Reading Program last year?

   Yes _____ No _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's?

   a. _____ Inferior b. _____ About the same c. _____ Superior

4. Would you be interested in your school participating in a similar program next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. We would be especially interested in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item #1 above.

Name _____ Date _____

School _____

APPENDIX C

Reading Teacher Background

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

District 15 - State Urban Education Reading Program

READING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
TRAINING AND BACKGROUND

School _____ Date _____

Reading Teacher _____

READING TEACHER BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree	Year	Institution	Major Field
_____	____	_____	_____
_____	____	_____	_____
_____	____	_____	_____

2. COURSE WORK RELEVANT TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those courses which you have taken and indicate the institution and year. (Do not include inservice courses here.)

Content of Course	Institution	Year
____Foundations of Reading Instruction	_____	____
____Diagnostic Techniques - Reading	_____	____
____Corrective Reading Instruction	_____	____
____Reading in the Content Areas	_____	____
____Teaching Individualized Reading	_____	____
Other		
_____	_____	____
_____	_____	____

READING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (page 2)

3. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

School	Grades	No. of Years	Regular or Substitute

4. EXPERIENCES SPECIFIC TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those experiences which you have had and the number of years.

Experience	No. of Years
____Corrective Reading - Public Schools	
____Corrective Reading - Non-Public Schools	
____After-School Tutorial Reading Program	
____Parent-Volunteer Reading Tutor	
____Private Tutorial work in Reading	
Other	

5. IN-SERVICE COURSES IN CORRECTIVE READING

List the in-service courses relevant to Corrective Reading which you took before this academic year.

Course	Year

READING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (page 2)

6. PRESENT IN-SERVICE COURSES

List any in-service courses related to Corrective Reading which you have taken this year.

Course	Instructor
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

EVALUATION STAFF

Professor Sheldon Kastner
Project Director

Professor Merrill T. Hollinshead
Project Coordinator

Professor Emilio Guerra
Professor June McLeod
Professor Elazar Pedhazar
Professor Lenore Ringler
Professor Irene Shigaki
Consultants

Barbara Jo Zimmer
Research Assistant